

Application No. 10/627102
Amendment dated October 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2005

Docket No.: 84150US1

REMARKS

Claims 22-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-10, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as described in paragraphs 6-8 of the Office action. Claims 1, 2, 11 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as described in paragraphs 10-14 of the Office action. Claims 3-9 and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as described in paragraphs 16-39 of the Office action. Claims 10 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as described in paragraphs 40-47 of the Office action. Claims 21, 23 and 24 are the only pending independent claims.

The drawings were objected to for reasons discussed in paragraph 2 of the Office action. Applicants respectfully submit that corrected drawings are not required for the following reasons.

Item S18 of FIG. 7 corresponds with the description thereof in paragraph [0042] of the specification. Similarly, item S20 of FIG. 7 corresponds with the description thereof in paragraph [0043] of the specification. Further, item S18 of FIG. 7 is not identical to item S20 of FIG. 7 and the description in paragraph [0042] is not identical to the description in paragraph [0043] of the specification.

In light of the above-discussion, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The disclosure was objected to for reasons discussed in paragraph 4 of the Office action. The specification has been amended to remove the incorporation-by-reference language. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

As claims 1-20 have been canceled, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding rejections to claims 1-20 are moot.

Applicants extend thanks to the Examiner for conducting the personal interview on September 12, 2005. Newly added claims 21-25 are patentable over the prior art of record for the reasons discussed during the interview and repeated below.

During the Interview, Applicants indicated that one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would understand the meaning of the phrase "minimize data communication." In order to expedite prosecution, the Examiner suggested that the independent claims more clearly indicate that acknowledging of the transmission from the first processor to the second processor minimizes data

Application No. 10/627102
Amendment dated October 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2005

Docket No.: 84150US1

communication. Each of independent claims 21, 23 and 24 recite language as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21, 23 and 24 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

As further discussed during the Interview, neither Design and Assurance Strategy for the NRL Pump, Kang et al. (Kang 1998), A Network Pump, Kang et al. (Kang 1996) or Wilkes et al., discloses or suggests, either alone or in combination, that which is recited in independent claims 21, 23 and 24.

As point out by the Applicants and agreed by the Examiner during the Interview, neither Kang 1998 or Kang 1996 discloses or suggests: 1) exchanging limited status and control information between the first processor and the second processor; or 2) minimizing data communication from the second network to the first network by transmitting to the interface, then transmitting to the second processor, exchanging limited status and control information between the first processor and the second processor and acknowledging at the probabilistic rate the transmission from the first processor to the second processor.

It is submitted that each of the independent claims recites the above-discussed features. As suggested by the Examiner, each of the independent claims additionally more clearly presents the limited status and control information.

Because neither Kang 1998 nor Kang 1996 discloses that which is recited in independent claims 21, 23 and 24, it is submitted that each of the claims are novel within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Kang 1998 and Kang 1996. Further, because of the differences between that which is recited in the claims and that which is disclosed in Kang 1998 and Kang 1996, it would not have been obvious to modify either one of Kang 1998 and Kang 1996 to arrive at the claims within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In light of the above discussion, all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that can be resolved by telephone interview, the examiner is asked to call the Applicants' attorney Thomas D. Robbins at 202-404-1553.


Application No. 10/627102
Amendment dated October 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2005

Docket No.: 84150US1

Kindly charge any additional fees due or credit overpayment of fees to Deposit Account
Number 50-0281.

Dated: October 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Thomas D. Robbins

Registration No.: 43,369
US NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY
4555 Overlook Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20375
(202) 767-3427
Attorney for Applicants